

NOV 16 2005

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PARAMJIT SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-75166

Agency No. A74-153-432

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted November 8, 2005^{**}

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY, and BERZON, Circuit Judges

Paramjit Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) summarily affirming an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) order denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal,

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). Reviewing for substantial evidence, *see Kasnecovic v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 812, 813 (9th Cir. 2005), we deny the petition for review.

Singh’s contention that no adverse credibility finding was made is unavailing. The IJ expressly found Singh to be “an incredible witness.” Because Singh does not challenge the IJ’s adverse credibility determination on appeal, he has waived this issue. *See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(9)(A); Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996).

In the absence of credible testimony, Singh’s application for withholding of removal also fails. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Singh did not raise his request for relief under the CAT in his brief to this Court, and has therefore waived this issue. *See Martinez-Serrano*, 94 F.3d at 1259.

Singh’s contention that streamlining was inappropriate is foreclosed by *Garcia-Martinez v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 1066, 1078 (9th Cir. 2004).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Singh’s request that his case be remanded to the BIA so that he may apply for adjustment of status based on marriage. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(A).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.